

**MINUTES OF THE GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
JULY 25, 2007**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Michael Stout, Cynthia Hatfield, David Wharton, Andrena Coleman, Thomas Sears and Gina Freyaldenhoven.

STAFF PRESENT: Stefan-Leih Geary, Housing and Community Development (HCD).
Mike Williams, City Attorney's Office and Russ Clegg, HCD staff.

WELCOME:

Chair Stout welcomed everyone to the July 25, 2007 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Chair Stout confirmed that all Commissioners had received their information packets, no Commissioners had a conflict of interest with regard to any items on the agenda, and no Commissioners had discussed any applications prior to the meeting. Ms. Hatfield excused herself from Item 3-g, 111 Cypress Street, on the agenda. Ms. Geary also stated that a request had been received in writing for item 3-j, 215 S. Mendenhall Street, to be continued until next month's meeting.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Ms. Geary stated that Rhonda Askew resigned from the Commission. The absences of Ms. Hensley and Ms. Kelly were approved.

APPROVAL OF MAY 30, 2007 MINUTES:

Mr. Wharton moved to approve the May 30, 2007 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- a) **Application No. 885**
 Location: 601 N. Church Street
 Applicant: Kiet A. Nguyen
 Property Owner: Fischer Choir Trust
 Date Application Received: 5-18-07

(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work: (continued)

Replace existing vinyl windows with wood double-hung windows.

Staff Comments and Recommendations:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion this project is congruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines, Windows and Doors, (page 55) for the following reasons:

Facts:

The original wood windows were replaced with vinyl windows. Vinyl windows are considered incompatible with the character of the house and the historic district.

The applicant is proposing to use a high quality wood simulated divided light (SDL) window sash. This product has many of the character defining features of an original wood window sash and can match the dimensions of rails, stiles, meeting rails, etc.

The original windows are in a two-over-two pattern. Muntins are permanently attached to both the exterior and interior of the glazing and in the same muntin configuration as the original.

Guidelines (page 57-58):

2. *Retain and preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, casings, muntins, trim, frames, thresholds, hardware and shutters. If repair of an original window or door element is necessary, repair only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, composition, material, dimension, and detail by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the deteriorated section. The removal of historic materials shall be avoided.*
3. *When repair is not feasible, as determined by City staff, true divided light wood windows are an appropriate replacement product for original wood windows, when designed to match the original in appearance, detail, material, profile, and overall size as closely as possible. Double-paned glass may be considered when they are true divided and can accurately resemble the original window design.*
 - A. *It is not appropriate to replace true divided light windows with vinyl windows or windows with snap-in muntins.*
 - B. *Window products will be reviewed on an individual basis using the following criteria:*
 1. *Kind and texture of materials*
 2. *Architectural and historical compatibility*
 3. *Comparison to original window profile*
 4. *Level of significance of original windows to the architectural style of the building*
 5. *Existence of lead paint or other safety hazards*
 6. *Material performance and durability*

Recommended Conditions:

That the replacement window sash be wood, double-hung, simulated divided light window sash that matches dimensions and details of the original window sash as closely as possible.

That a sample of the replacement window be provided to the Commission for approval.

That the new windows be installed within a designated time frame.

That the remaining original windows be repaired.

In support:

David Shubb, 211 W. Bessemer Avenue
Kiet Nguyen, 2212 Crestridge Road

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Stout stated that this is for work at 601 North Church Street. The applicant is Kiet Nguyen. The description is to replace vinyl windows with appropriate wooden windows. This is an after-the-fact application. Ms. Geary indicated that staff is in support of this application and it is staff's opinion that this project is congruous with Historic District Design Guidelines for Windows and Doors on pages 57-58, Guidelines 2 and 3. Also, the Design Review Committee met with the applicant and New Home Building Supply to talk about solutions for replacing the windows with an appropriate window and window pattern. City staff stated that New Home Building Supply indicated that the 2-over-2 muntin pattern can be manufactured. The old windows were a 2-over-2 window pattern. Staff recognizes the need for a more energy efficient window and is proposing a simulated divided light window in the

2-over-2 pattern. It would have a muntin pattern on the interior and the exterior. We heard from David Shubb, of 211 W. Bessemer Ave., in support of the application. He represented the Neighborhood Association of Fisher Park, and he stated the neighborhood supported the application although they had some concerns about making sure the Commission reviewed the quality and design of the window, there was prompt replacement, and that a schedule was set. Mr. Shubb also mentioned guidelines indicating that true divided light windows be used when replacing windows but the neighborhood association understood in this situation the need for simulated divided light. Also speaking in support of the application was Kiet Nguyen, the applicant, residing at 2212 Crestridge Road. He indicated that he was not aware when he removed the windows that he couldn't do so and thought that they were not repairable. He wanted to fix the mistake and has been working with Mike Cowhig and New Home Building Supply to try to come up with a solution. He indicated that it would be acceptable to him if the 2-over-2 pattern could be done, and when asked about the time frame, he indicated that he would like to have a year. He stated that he would do the repair unit by unit and that there were four units in the building.

Discussion:

Ms. Freyaldenhoven stated her concern with the time frame adding that three months for completion is more reasonable. Ms. Hatfield agreed and added that the main elevation should be completed first as it is more visible. Ms. Coleman asked that availability of windows from the manufacturer be taken into account when determining a time frame. Commission members agreed that the front and street-facing sides should be completed by the end of the year with another three months allowed for completion of the remaining sides.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Freyaldenhoven moved that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 885 in the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments presented are acceptable as findings of fact. Ms. Hatfield seconded the motion. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Hatfield, Wharton, Coleman, Sears and Freyaldenhoven. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Freyaldenhoven moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approve Application No. 885 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Kiet Nguyen for work at 601 N. Church Street with the following conditions: (1) that the replacement window sash be wood, double-hung, two-over-two to look like the originals, simulated divided light window sash that matches the dimensions and details of the original windows as closely as possible (2) a sample has been shown and the Commission approves (3) the new windows on the front and side streets be installed by the end of the year with the remaining windows replaced three months after that (4) and that the remaining original windows be repaired. Ms. Hatfield seconded the motion. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Hatfield, Wharton, Coleman, Sears and Freyaldenhoven. Nays: None.)

b) Application No. 899
Location: 914 N. Elm Street
Applicant: Matt Duehring, Web Builders Studios
Property Owner: Dawn Chaney
Date Application Received: 4-23-07

(DENIED)

Description of Work:

Install new sign.

Staff Comments and Recommendations:

Based on information contained in the application and review by the Design Review Committee, the staff recommends against granting a Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is not congruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines—Signs (page 33) for the following reasons:

Facts:

The proposal is for a new sign approximately 8' tall. The sign face is rectangular and proposed at 3 feet by 4 feet. The applicant will use either metal or wood materials.

The sign will be located in the parking lot on the Bessemer Street side of the property near the public sidewalk in the location of a previous sign. This type of sign is generally aimed at passing automobile traffic and is not in keeping with the pedestrian scale of the historic districts.

The size, height and orientation of the proposed sign blocks views of significant architectural structures along Elm Street.

The building has existing identification signage.

Guidelines (page 34):

1. *Introduce unobtrusive, simple signage in the historic districts.*
2. *New signs should be no larger than necessary to identify the building they serve, and located so that they do not block pedestrian views along the street*
3. *Select traditional materials for new signs including wood, metal, stone, and masonry. Carved or sandblasted signboards are generally not appropriate in the Historic Districts. Signs should be painted, and may be lighted with concealed spotlights.*
4. *An appropriate location for a freestanding sign in a residential area is close to the front walk and near the public sidewalk.*

In support:

Matthew Duehring, 914 N. Elm Street

In Opposition:

David Shubb, 211 W. Bessemer Avenue

Summary:

Chair Stout stated Application 899 is for work at 914 North Elm Street. The applicant is Matthew Duehring and the description of the work is sign installation. City staff did not recommend in favor of this application stating that it did not meet the design guidelines. There were concerns that the sign was too tall for pedestrian scale, too large, and signage is already on the building. The Design Review Committee also visited the site and wasn't comfortable with the size of the sign. The staff noted the Historic District Design Guidelines for Signs on page 33 and 34, Guidelines 1 through 4. In support of the application was Matthew Duehring, of 914 N. Elm Street. He indicated that he was flexible with the size of the sign and that he had been given contrary information from the City Transportation Department. He also indicated that this was a replacement sign and that other signs in the area were as large or larger. In opposition to the application was David Shubb of 211 W. Bessemer Avenue, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He indicated that the neighborhood opposed the application and noted that the applicant already had signs on the building and questioned the need for additional signage. If additional signage was needed, Mr. Shubb stated that it should be smaller in scale and pedestrian friendly. In rebuttal, Mr. Duehring stated that he felt he had been given information that supported the size of the sign. Chair Stout stated that some of the information may just be miscommunication from the Transportation Department versus the Historic Preservation District Design Guidelines. Also, Chair Stout noted that the Cobb Chiropractic sign is a much older sign and the building he is asking to put a sign at was a much earlier building before the Historic District was put in place.

Discussion:

Mr. Wharton moved that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 899 in the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments and Guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 (which states billboards and other tall freestanding signs, portable signs, flashing or lighted message signs, plastic signs and signs with internally illuminated letters are not appropriate in historic districts), 7 c (signage for new commercial buildings should reflect similar placement to that of historic commercial buildings in the neighborhood), are acceptable as findings of fact. Ms. Freyaldenhoven seconded the motion. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Hatfield, Wharton, Coleman, Sears and Freyaldenhoven. Nays: None.)

Therefore, Mr. Wharton moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve Application No. 899 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Matt Duehring for work at 914 N. Elm Street, seconded by Ms. Freyaldenhoven. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Hatfield, Wharton, Coleman, Sears and Freyaldenhoven. Nays: None.)

Chair Stout stated that although the application has been denied, the applicant is encouraged to work with City staff to line up the appropriate people to resolve this and get a sign.

Mr. Williams added that the 75 feet mentioned earlier was in reference to a visibility area of 75 feet and this is throughout the city in historic and non-historic districts. He stated between 30 inches and 80 inches has to be clear. A sign would have to be lower than 30 inches and not intrude between 30 inches and 80 inches.

- c) **Application No. 934**
Location: 210 Isabel Street
Applicant: Jeff Dunham
Property Owner: Jeff and Catherine Dunham
Description of Work: Tree removal and replacement
Date Application Received: 6-21-07 **(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)**

Tree removal and replacement.

Based on information contained in the application and review by the Design Review Committee the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21) for the following reasons:

The applicant removed several trees of varying condition as part of a project to landscape the back yard and construct a parking area/turnaround.

At the May HPC meeting, the Commission denied an application for the removal of the trees and requested that the applicant provide more documentation and a “one-for-one” replacement. The

applicant has provided a chart identifying the trees removed and specifications, and the replacement tree sizes and varieties.

All new trees are significantly larger sized than required by the City's Tree Ordinance and are/will be planted as part of a detailed landscaping design for the rear property. The project proposes a row of five 12' to 14' tall wax myrtle trees to replace the five Leland cypress trees that were removed. The new row of wax myrtle trees will re-establish privacy screening along the rear property line. Wax myrtle trees are considered a rapid-growing tree and are evergreens, providing year round foliage.

Additional trees planted include two 12' tall magnolias, one 10' live oak, one 8' to 10' dogwood, two 10' crape myrtles and a Japanese maple.

For comparison, under the City's Tree Ordinance, an under story tree such as a wax myrtle is required to be 4' at time of planting.

Guidelines (page 23):

1. *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.*
5. *Replace mature trees with similar canopy and in the same location when they are damaged or diseased. When same site location is not practical, select locations for replacement trees that would enhance the appearance and character of the historic streetscape.*

Recommended Condition:

If any trees die within two years they must be replaced.

In support:

Jeff Dunham, 210 Isabel Street

In Opposition:

David Shubb, 211 W. Bessemer Avenue.
Catherine Fenney, 207 North Park Drive
John McLendon, #2 Magnolia Court

Ms. Coleman was excused from the rest of the meeting.

Summary:

Chair Stout stated that this is for work at 210 Isabel Street. The applicant is Jeff Dunham and this is an after-the-fact application relating to removal of trees. City staff indicated that there were some oversized trees planted and the Urban Forester was impressed with the size of the trees that had been used in the application. The Design Review Committee met and reviewed the site and felt the landscape plan was appropriate and staff supports this application with the condition that if any trees die within two years, they must be replaced. In support of this application was Jeff Dunham of 210 Isabel Street who provided information relating to the landscaping and tree removal in response to the Commission's request for information at the last meeting. In opposition was David Shubb of 211 W. Bessemer Avenue representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He indicated the neighborhood association voted to oppose this application. They felt mature trees had been removed and not replaced and some of the trees used in the landscaping were not canopy trees. He mentioned Little Gem magnolias. He indicated that there was a drainage issue and he felt the parking area was too large and too close to the back of the property. Mr. Shubb suggested that two additional canopy trees that might be a solution, reduce the parking turn-around area, and address the drainage issues. Also in opposition was Katherine Feeney of 207 N. Park Drive who provided photos and showed concern over the loss of tree canopy, the increase in drainage issues, the loss of green space, and she indicated she had some silt issues. John McLendon of #2 Magnolia Court also spoke in opposition to

this application. He thought an alternative to this issue would be to replace the willow oak with a larger tree and then replacing the Little Gem magnolias with canopy trees. In rebuttal, Jeff Dunham, of 210 Isabel Street, reminded the Commission that it is a joint driveway and when looking at the concrete, it must be taken into account that part of the concrete belongs to his neighbor. He also added that the garage in the photos is his neighbor's garage, and the pavement in front of the garage is his neighbor's pavement. He indicated that it was not his responsibility to provide a buffer for his neighbor. Mr. Dunham also indicated that he would consider putting in an additional canopy tree.

Discussion:

Commission members agreed that a substantial replanting needs to be done with a couple of canopy trees that are fairly mature.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Sears moved that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 934 in the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments and Guidelines 1 and 5 on page 23 of the Manual are acceptable as findings of fact. Ms. Hatfield seconded the motion. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Hatfield, Wharton, Sears and Freyaldenhoven. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Sears moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approve Application No. 934 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jeff Dunham for work at 210 Isabel Street with the conditions that at least two canopy trees with a minimum 2-inch diameter be placed in as near a location as possible to give a maximum effective canopy for the area (in addition to the live oak that is already there), and to work with staff on that placement. Ms. Hatfield seconded the motion. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Hatfield, Wharton, Sears and Freyaldenhoven. Nays: None.)

d) **Application No. 942**
Location: 614-620 N. Elm Street
Applicant: Emmett Sumner
Property Owner: First Presbyterian Church
Date Application Received: 7-11-07

(CONTINUED)

Description of Work:

Expansion and landscaping of existing parking lot.

Staff Comments and Recommendations:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines—Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas (page 28) and Trees and Landscaping (page 23) for the following reasons:

Fact:

The project proposes to reconfigure two existing parking areas. The reconfiguration will require an expansion of pavement in some areas while reducing pavement and increasing landscaping in other areas. The paved surface areas will be resurfaced to provide a uniform appearance. The project will use existing lighting.

Guidelines:

10. Select appropriate materials, such as concrete, brick, asphalt, or crushed stone for surfacing

parking areas.

8. *Grading for new parking areas should not dramatically change the topography of the site or increase water runoff onto adjoining properties.*

Fact:

The plan proposes to plant an evergreen screening of Carissa holly, Hoogendorn holly and Cherry laurel trees to minimize visual impact from the street and surrounding properties.

Guideline:

7. *Design new parking areas to minimize their effect upon the neighborhood environment. Locate them to the rear of buildings, and screen them from view with landscaping and/or fencing. The Commission may consider alternate locations when properly screened and landscaped.*

Fact:

The project proposes to maintain existing mature trees including:

Along the Northern property line:

- One 42" oak tree
- One 18" gum tree
- One 8" hemlock tree
- One 30" oak tree

Along the Eastern property line:

- One 23" oak tree
- Three approximately 7" pecan trees

Along the Western property line:

- One 48" oak tree

The project will require the removal of one 23" oak tree in the Northeast portion of the property.

Fact:

The plan proposes to plant three Allee elm trees along the N. Elm Street property line which will increase the number of large canopy street trees along this portion of N. Elm Street. The plan proposes additional Allee elm canopy trees and understory trees at various locations on the property. The Allee elm tree variety is a favored choice for urban canopy trees and is considered ideal for parking lot islands and planting pits surrounded by pavement.

Fact:

The plan proposes a landscaping island in the center of the parking area which will serve to visually break up any large expanses of paved surface area. Two Allee elm trees will be planted in the island.

Guideline (page 30):

9. *Divide large expanses of pavement into smaller components with planting areas. Incorporate existing large trees and shrubs into the landscaping for new parking areas when possible.*

Guidelines (page 23):

1. *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.*

5. *Replace mature trees with similar canopy and in the same location when they are damaged or diseased. When same site location is not practical, select locations for replacement trees that would enhance the appearance and character of the historic streetscape.*
6. *Take all precautions to protect existing trees during new construction, paving and any site work.*

Conditions:

That the applicant works with a licensed landscape architect and the City's Urban Forester to develop a tree preservation plan for submittal to staff and that the preservation plan is followed by all parties involved to ensure that mature trees are not damaged.

That any new or existing trees that do not survive for a minimum of three years be replaced with like variety and location at a minimum of 4" diameter at breast height.

In support:

Rick Horne, 5605 Watercrest Drive

In Opposition:

David Shubb, 211 W. Bessemer Street

David Craft, 605 N. Church Street

John McLendon, #2 Magnolia Court

Summary:

Chair Stout stated this is Application 942 for work at 614-620 North Elm Street. The applicant is Emmett A. Sumner, Jr. representing First Presbyterian Church. The description of work is to reconfigure an existing parking lot and to create a parking lot on a currently vacant lot. Staff indicated that this application is congruous with the Design Guidelines for Walkways, Driveways, and Parking Areas on page 28 and Trees and Landscaping on page 23, guidelines 7, 8, and 10. Also indicated was guideline 9 on page 30 and guidelines 1, 5, and 6 on page 23. There were conditions that the trees would have to survive and be replaced with like variety and location with a minimum of 4" at breast height. Also, the applicant's work will be with a licensed landscape architect and the City's Urban Forester to develop a tree preservation plan for submittal to staff and that the preservation plan is followed by all parties to insure that the mature trees are not damaged. In support of this application was Rick Horne of 5605 Watercrest Drive. He was representing First Presbyterian Church and is in charge of the buildings and grounds. He stated there had been a high priority to save the existing trees and First Presbyterian has a willingness to work with the Urban Forester. He indicated they had met with the neighborhood association trying to incorporate some of the neighborhood's recommendations in their plan. Speaking in opposition to this application was David Shubb of 211 W. Bessemer Avenue who represented the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He recommended that the application be denied giving several different reasons. One reason was due to the removal of the 23" oak. The plan calls for the asphalt and curb cuts to be too close to the root zone. He felt the parking should be limited and not so close to the critical root zone area. He also felt that the plants would not be in keeping with the neighborhood character and the hedging was too solid and there was a concern over safety because of that. David Craft of 605 N. Church Street also spoke in opposition and was adamant that a tree protection plan was needed in advance. He urged denial or continuation of the application as the trees would likely die without a protection plan. He also indicated that the tree being removed provides significant screening in the neighborhood and provides a tree canopy to Magnolia Court. He also thought the plants being recommended were too contemporary. Also in opposition was John McLendon, of #2 Magnolia Court, who was concerned over the loss of the trees and canopy. He felt this application should be denied and a tree protection plan should be required. Mr. McLendon added that there were approximately 67 parking spaces in this plan and he felt a compromise could be worked out to save the tree recommended to be cut down with only minor parking spots being eliminated. Again, he felt this application should be denied without a tree preservation plan. In rebuttal, Rick Horne, of 5605 Watercrest Drive, stated that he shared the concerns over the trees. He stated

they created an island to break up the parking and would be willing to work with the tree preservation plan.

Discussion:

Chair Stout agreed that a tree preservation plan should be followed. Commission members discussed the adverse effects of cutting down the 23" tree and landscaping buffers for parking areas. Ms. Geary gave a brief summary of the process that this plan will follow and indicated that a continuation to next month's meeting is certainly acceptable. The applicant stated that they would be willing to continue this and review the issues that have been brought up.

Motion:

Mr. Wharton motioned that a continuance be granted, seconded by Ms. Hatfield. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Hatfield, Wharton, Sears and Freyaldenhoven. Nays: None.)

- e) **Application No. 926**
Location: 627 Summit Avenue
Applicant: Neil Lewis
Property Owner: Neil Lewis
Date Application Received: 6-7-07 **(DENIED)**

Description of Work:

Paint exterior of building; close in one entrance door at rear of building.

Note: Closing in one entrance door at the rear of the building can be approved at the staff level.

Staff Comments and Recommendations:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion this project is not congruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines, Non-Contributing Structures (page 67) and Exterior Materials and Finishes (page 44) for the following reasons:

Facts:

This a “non-contributing” masonry building constructed of dark brown bricks.

The original color of the bricks allows the building to blend with the historic tree canopy and landscaping on the property drawing little attention to the building itself.

Painting the brick would result in an incompatible exterior finish since painting masonry was seldom done in historic districts.

Additionally, painting brick can create water damage to masonry structures and is strongly discouraged.

Guidelines:

1. *Every effort should be made to maintain the architectural integrity of non-contributing structures. Replacement materials should be carefully evaluated to ensure that they maintain the character of the building and the district. For example, covering of wood trim with vinyl on a brick building is not recommended.*
5. *It is not appropriate to apply paint or other coatings to unpainted wall materials, and materials that were left unpainted historically. Traditional masonry materials such as brick, slate, and stone, as well as unpainted shingles should remain unpainted.*

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

Mebane Hamm, 675 Percy Street

Summary:

Chair Stout stated that this is Application No. 926 for work at 627 Summit Avenue. The applicant was Neil Lewis and the description was to paint the exterior of the building. City staff stated they didn't feel this application was congruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines for Noncontributing Structures on page 67 and Exterior Materials and Finishes on page 44. This is a non-contributing masonry building constructed of dark brown bricks. The original color of the bricks allows the building to blend with the historic tree canopy and landscaping on the property drawing little attention to the building itself. Painting the brick would result in an incompatible exterior finish since painting masonry was seldom done in historic districts. Additionally, painting brick can create water damage to masonry structures and strongly discouraged. Staff referenced Guideline 1: Every effort should be made to maintain the architectural integrity of non-contributing structures. Replacement materials should be carefully evaluated to ensure that they maintain the character of the building and the district. For example, covering of wood trim with vinyl on a brick building is not recommended. Also referenced was Guideline 5: It is not appropriate to apply paint or other coatings to unpainted wall materials, and materials that were left unpainted historically. Traditional masonry materials such as brick, slate, and stone, as well as unpainted shingles should remain unpainted. There was no one in support of this application. Speaking in opposition to this application was Mebane Hamm, 675 Percy Street, representing the Aycock Neighborhood Association. She indicated the association did not support this application and they had concerns over not receiving color samples, the maintenance issue of painting brick, precedence for painting brick, and exterior alterations to contributing or non-contributing structures.

Discussion:

Staff briefly discussed the integrity and natural appearance of the brick.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Wharton moved that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 926 in the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments and Guideline 1 from page 67 and Guideline 5 from page 44 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Hatfield, Wharton, Sears and Freyaldenhoven. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Wharton moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve Application No. 926 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Neil Lewis for work at 627 Summit Avenue, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Hatfield, Wharton, Sears and Freyaldenhoven. Nays: None.)

f) **Application No. 919**
Location: 709 Percy Street
Applicant: Bev and Ernie Kehayes
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 5-25-07

(DENIED)

Description of Work:

Remove original porch floor and replace with concrete flooring painted porch gray.

Staff Comments and Recommendations:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion this project is not congruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines, Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page44) for the following reasons:

Facts:

This is a contributing structure in the historic district. The original porch floor is wood tongue and groove. The wood slats run perpendicular to the length of the porch creating an overhang by the exposed ends of each board. The wood material and construction method is a character defining feature of historic porch floors.

The project proposes to reuse the original balustrade or replace it to match.

Guidelines:

- 1. Preserve and maintain historic materials and features of historic porches such as tongue-and-groove flooring, beaded board ceiling boards, trim, railings, lattice, entablatures, columns, steps, balustrades, brackets, soffits, fascia boards, and decorative trim. If a porch element or detail is deteriorated and requires replacement, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in material, size, scale, texture and detail. It is not appropriate to replace deteriorated porch elements with incompatible materials, such as metal supports and railings for wooden columns and rails or concrete for wooden steps.*

Note: Repairs to the porch balustrade to match the original does not require a COA. However, the materials, dimensions, design, height and scale must match the original.

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

Mebane Hamm, 675 Percy Street

Summary:

Chair Stout stated that this is Application No. 919 for work at 709 Percy Street. The applicants are Bev and Ernie Kehayes and the description is to replace tongue and groove porch flooring with a concrete floor. Staff indicated that this was incongruous with the Historic District Guidelines for Porches, Entrances, and Balconies on page 44 and Guideline 1 on page 44. There was no one speaking in support of the application. Speaking in opposition to the application was Mebane Hamm, of 675 Percy Street, representing the Aycock Neighborhood Association. She indicated that the neighborhood association did not support this application.

Discussion:

None.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Freyaldenhoven moved that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 919 in the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments and Guideline 1 from page 44 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Hatfield, Wharton, Sears and Freyaldenhoven. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Freyaldenhoven moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve Application No. 919 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Bev and Ernie KeHayes for work at 709 Percy Street, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Hatfield, Wharton, Sears and Freyaldenhoven. Nays: None.)

g) Application No. 932
Location: 111 Cypress Street
Applicant: William K. Pixley
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 6-13-07

(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Alterations to front porch and general exterior repairs.

Staff Comments and Recommendations:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness, with conditions. In the staff's opinion this project is congruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines, Exterior Walls: Materials and Finishes (page 44) and Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 62) for the following reasons:

Facts:

- 1) This is a contributing structure in the historic district undergoing an extensive restoration/rehab. Exterior repairs include replacing deteriorated wood shingles, siding, window casings, etc. to match the original. Original windows have been rebuilt. One porch column will be moved 2 ½" to align with the foundation. The repair work being done meets the guidelines and does not require a COA.
- 2) The applicant proposes to install decorative molding on the primary facade of the building under the porch soffit. As part of this additional detailing, a diamond shaped pattern will also be painted. Painting does not require a COA. However, while a seemingly minor change, the addition of the dentil molding is not original to the design of the building and would be adding an architectural feature that is not original.
- 3) The original porch ceiling was replaced by a previous owner with plywood sheets. The applicant has installed decorative trim pieces on the ceiling and has built light boxes to conceal electrical wiring. These new features are not easily visible from the street and have not required the removal of original historic materials.
- 4) The existing balcony railing is being repaired to match with the addition of one upper porch support for structural purposes. The porch support will be wood to match the original supports in material and design.

Guidelines (page 64):

2. Preserve and maintain historic materials and features of historic porches such as tongue-and-groove flooring, beaded board ceiling boards, trim, railings, lattice, entablatures, columns, steps, balustrades, brackets, soffits, fascia boards, and decorative trim. If a porch element or detail is deteriorated and requires replacement, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in material, size, scale, texture and detail. It is not appropriate to replace deteriorated porch elements with incompatible materials, such as metal supports and railings for wooden columns and rails, or concrete for wooden steps.

Guidelines (page 47):

2. *Preserve historic architectural features of exterior walls such as cornices, brackets, bays, turrets, fascias, and decorative moldings. It is not appropriate to remove these features rather than repair or replace with matching features.*
3. *Locate vents or mechanical connections through walls that are non character-defining walls or inconspicuously on rear or sidewalls of the structure where they are not visible from the street.*

Conditions:

That the dentil molding not be added to the exterior porch soffit as proposed.

That detailed drawings or photographs be provided to staff showing the design and construction of additional balcony columns/supports.

That all work must meet building code and minimum housing standards.

That the exterior work be completed within six months.

Note: The following projects listed on the application require additional information and are not part of this application:

- Installation of a privacy fence
- Installation of porch lights on upper porch columns
- Construction of rock wall
- Construction of deck and back addition

n Support:

William Pixley, 111 Cypress Street
Mebane Hamm, 675 Percy Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Stout stated that this is Application No. 932 for work at 111 Cypress Street. The applicant is William Pixley. City staff's opinion is that this application is congruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines for Exterior Walls, Materials and Finishes starting on page 44 and Porches, Entrances, and Balconies starting on page 62. Staff indicated guidelines on page 62, number 2 and guidelines 2 and 3 on page 47. Staff supports this with conditions that the dentil molding not be added to the exterior porch soffit as proposed, that detailed drawings or photographs be provided to staff showing the design and construction of additional balcony column/supports, that all work must meet building code and minimum housing standards, and that the exterior work be completed within six months. There were other projects listed on the application that require additional information and are not part of this information. These projects include installation of a privacy fence, installation of porch lights on upper porch columns, construction of rock wall, and construction of deck and back addition. In support of this application was William Pixley, of 111 Cypress Street, who indicated he felt this was a kit house and

the dentil molding could have been an appropriate material. Also in support was Mebane Hamm who represented the Aycock Neighborhood Association. She indicated that the association does support this application with the exception of the light boxes and they have a question as to whether the dentil molding is really appropriate.

Discussion:

Mr. Wharton moved to recuse Ms. Hatfield, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Commission members briefly discussed the front porch light boxes.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Wharton moved that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 932 in the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments and Guideline 2 from page 64 and Guidelines 2 and 3 page 47, and also Secretary of Interior's Standards on page 16, number 3, which says each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use, and changes that create a false sense of historical development such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings shall not be undertaken, are acceptable as findings of fact. Mr. Sears seconded the motion. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Wharton, Sears and Freyaldenhoven. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Wharton moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application No. 932 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to William K. Pixley for work at 111 Cypress Street with the conditions that the dentil molding not be added to the exterior porch soffit as proposed, that detailed drawings or photographs be provided to Staff showing the design and construction of additional balcony columns/supports, that all work meet building code and minimum housing standards, and that the exterior work be completed within six months, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Wharton, Sears and Freyaldenhoven. Nays: None.)

h) Application No. 943

Location: 613 Park Avenue

Applicant: Maliq Culbreath

Property Owner: Same

Date Application Received: 7-11-07

(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Alterations and repairs to front porch.

Staff Comments and Recommendations:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion this project is congruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines, Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 62) for the following reasons:

Facts:

This is a contributing structure in the historic district.

The application proposes to repair portions of the front porch and foundation. Only deteriorated elements and details will be replaced. Repairs will be made to match. This work does not require a COA.

As part of the application, the property owner wishes to replace square porch features with round features that are consistent with Colonial Revival style detailing.

The existing balcony railing pickets will be replaced with round pickets.

The front porch columns will be replaced with round columns.

The front steps will be rebuilt and made smaller as shown in the submitted drawing. The cheek walls will be rebuilt to correspond with the height and scale of the new steps.

Guidelines:

2. *Preserve and maintain historic materials and features of historic porches such as tongue-and-groove flooring, beaded board ceiling boards, trim, railings, lattice, entablatures, columns, steps, balustrades, brackets, soffits, fascia boards, and decorative trim. If a porch element or detail is deteriorated and requires replacement, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in material, size, scale, texture and detail. It is not appropriate to replace deteriorated porch elements with incompatible materials, such as metal supports and railings for wooden columns and rails, or concrete for wooden steps.*

In Support:

Maliq Culbreath, 613 Park Avenue
Mebane Hamm, 675 Percy Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Stout stated that this is Application No. 943 for work at 613 Park Avenue. The applicant is Maliq Culbreath and the description of work is reconstruction of front porch/balcony and steps. City staff indicated that the project is congruous with the Historic District Guidelines, Porches, Entrances, and Balconies on page 62. Ms. Geary presented Guideline 2 as the support for being congruous with the guidelines. In support of this application was Maliq Culbreath. He indicated he would like to change the balustrades to be square initially with a bead, and then they would be round, and then square with a bead, and then square again. He also indicated that he wishes to replace the square front porch post with fiberglass reinforced polymer posts. He also wants to reduce the step width and align it with the sidewalk and the door. He needs to reposition the center post to center that in the porch and balcony structure and reduce the steps from three to two and he will make those steps consistent in dimension. The height of the balcony rail would stay the same as it is now. Also in support of this application was Mebane Hamm of 675 Percy Street. She represented the Aycock Neighborhood Association and indicated that they support this application.

Discussion:

There was a brief discussion regarding square versus round columns and the preference for wood columns.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Freyaldenhoven moved that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 943 in the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments and the Guidelines on page 62, item 2 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Wharton, Sears, Hatfield and Freyaldenhoven. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Freyaldenhoven moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application No. 943 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Maliq Culbreath for work at 613 Park Avenue with the condition that the columns, whether round or square and working with staff to determine that and the shape of the balusters, are wood. Also, that the balusters replicate the designs suggested on page 65, seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Wharton, Sears, Hatfield and Freyaldenhoven. Nays: None.)

- i) **Application No. 803**
Location: 912 Spring Garden Street

Applicant: Evan Catlett
Property Owner: Same
Date Received: 6-22-07

(CONTINUED)

Description of Work:

Demolition and removal of garage.

Staff Comments and Recommendations:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is not congruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines—Demolition (page 73) and Garages and Accessory Structures (page 35) for the following reasons:

Fact:

The garage, while in deteriorating condition, is considered a "contributing" structure in the College Hill National Register Historic District. The possibility of repair should be further investigated.

Guidelines (page 36):

1. *Retain the original materials and features of historic garages and outbuildings including windows, doors, siding, trim, and latticework. If replacement of an element is necessary, match the original in design.*

Guidelines (page 73):

The demolition or removal of any structure in a Historic District requires a Certificate of Appropriateness. The commission may not deny an application for demolition, but it may delay the effective date of the Certificate for up to 365 days in the case of a structure that contributes to the character of the Historic District. Since the action cannot be reversed, the decision to demolish an historic structure should be carefully considered, and all alternatives to demolition should be explored. During the delay period, the Commission should negotiate with the owner or other interested parties including State and local preservation organizations and seek answers to the following questions:

- *Is there a well-developed proposal for the use of the site necessitating demolition?*
- *Could another site serve the purpose just as well?*
- *Could the existing structure be adapted to suit the owner's needs?*
- *Could the property be sold to someone willing to preserve the building?*
- *As a last resort, could the building be moved to another location?*
- *Does the site have known or potential archaeological significance?*
- *Is the structure of national, state or local significance?*
- *If alternatives to demolition are exhausted and approval for demolition is granted:*
- *Record the structure thoroughly with photographs and other documentation, including identifying and recording any special architectural features of the building, important landscape features, structures, and archeological significance of the site.*
- *Protect any large trees or other important landscape features during demolition.*
- *If the site is to remain vacant for more than 60 days, it should be cleared of debris, reseeded and maintained in a manner consistent with other properties in the Historic District.*

In Support:

Evan Catlett, 912 Spring Garden Street

Motion:

Mr. Wharton moved that this item be continued until the next meeting, seconded by Ms. Freyaldenhoven. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Wharton, Sears, Hatfield and Freyaldenhoven. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM THE COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Stout encouraged Commission members to urge representatives to support Historic Districts in the current climate of budget cuts and to let people know the positive effect Historic Districts have on our community.

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Ms. Geary asked the Commission if they would like to vote to create a Public Education and Outreach Committee. Ms. Freyaldenhoven moved that a subcommittee be established for the purpose of public education and community outreach, seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of this motion.

SPEAKERS FROM THE FLOOR:

None.

* * * * *

ADJOURN

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/jd:sm